

REMARKS

The present amendment is in response to the Office Action dated September 3, 2008. Claims 24, 27-37, 41, and 45-52, and 54-55 are now present in this case. Claims 1-23, 25-26, 38-40, 42-44, and 53 have been canceled. Claim 52 is allowed. Claims 24, 37, 41, and 51 are currently amended. No new claims have been added.

The applicant thanks the examiner for the telephonic interview the applicant's attorneys on October 27, 2008. The applicants have amended the claims in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions.

Rejections under § 103(a) – Su / Segur

Claims 24, 31, 33-34, 37 and 51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 5,815,800 to Su, combined with U.S. Patent No. 6,212,550 to Segur. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration.

The applicants believe these rejections are overcome because these claims have been amended to have an element not taught by the cited references alone or in combination, specifically: "the receiver configured to receive at least one message-classification rule from a database memory, wherein the database memory is associated with the wireless infrastructure at a location separate from the wireless device." Support for this amendment may be found in the application, as originally filed, page 5, line 19. For at least this reason, the applicants believe these rejections are overcome.

Rejections under § 103(a) – Su / Segur / Wicks

Claims 24, 31, 33-34, 37 and 51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable by Su, combined with Segur, and in further combination with U.S. Patent No. 5,796,394 to Wicks. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration.

The applicants believe these rejections are overcome because these claims have been amended to have an element not taught by the cited references alone or in combination, specifically: "the receiver configured to receive at least one message-

classification rule from a database memory, wherein the database memory is associated with the wireless infrastructure at a location separate from the wireless device.” Support for this amendment may be found in the application, as originally filed, page 5, line 19. For at least this reason, the applicants believe these rejections are overcome.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the subject application and its allowance are kindly requested. The applicants have made a good faith effort to place all claims in condition for allowance. If questions remain regarding the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (206) 757-8203.

Respectfully submitted,
Kent A. Hellebust et al.
Davis Wright Tremaine LLP

/Philip R. M. Hunt, Reg. #58,044/

Philip R. M. Hunt

1201 Third Avenue
Suite 2200
Seattle, Washington 98101
Phone: (206) 757-8203
Fax: (206) 757-7203